

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 1223 03729 4502

TORY OF EXISTING NEEDS FOR

Neighborhood centers

N FRANCISCO

N. MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS
OF SAN FRANCISCO, INC.
AND

ES - DUKES AND ASSOCIATES

S
U
M
M
A
R
Y

DOCUMENTS

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ED FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING - november 1975

D

REF
711.4097
In84s

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 1223 03729 4502

INVENTORY OF EXISTING NEEDS FOR

neighborhood centers

IN SAN FRANCISCO

SUMMARY

URBAN MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS
OF SAN FRANCISCO, INC.
AND

DUKES - DUKES AND ASSOCIATES

DOCUMENTS

PUBLIC LIBRARY

PREPARED FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING - november 1975

EF
11.4097
n84s

5/S

DOCUMENTS :



SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

REFERENCE
BOOK

Not to be taken from the Library

Contents

	Page
Summary of Study Process	1
Needs Assessment	2
Social Services Inventory	3
Survey of Existing Facilities	5
Neighborhood Experience With Housing and Community Development Funds	6
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRIORITY NEIGHBORHOODS	7
Administrative Structure	8
Development Process	10

D REF 711.4097 In84s

Inventory of existing
needs for neighborhood
1975.

SUMMARY

The study to "inventory existing needs for neighborhood centers" was undertaken as an initial step in San Francisco's Neighborhood Centers Program, funded through the Housing and Community Development Program. Urban Management Consultants of San Francisco, Inc., and Dukes-Dukes and Associates were engaged by the Department of City Planning to provide information to determine priority locations for such facilities in the City. This summary highlights the study process, the substantive information, and the policy recommendations contained in the Final Report.

Definition of Neighborhoods

Federal policy requires that Housing and Community Development funds benefit principally "families of low and moderate income". Neighborhoods whose average income is below that of the City (according to the 1970 Census) were therefore identified early in the study process. Efforts were made to define neighborhood boundaries closely with the consensus of neighborhood and City representatives. In addition, the minimum size of a neighborhood unit was defined as 4,000 residents - the minimum population necessary to support a multi-purpose facility.

After considering income and size, the following neighborhoods were identified for analysis:

Bayview-Hunters Point	Noe-Central
Bernal Heights	North Beach
Chinatown	North of Market
Haight-Ashbury	Outer Mission
Ingleside	Potrero Hill
Inner Richmond	South of Market
Inner Sunset	Western Addition
Mission	Visitacion Valley

Summary of Study Process

Following the definition of neighborhoods, there were four basic elements involved to determine needs for neighborhood centers:

1. A Needs Assessment: a statistical analysis of standard need indicators which were available for all neighborhoods;

2. A Social Services Inventory: an inventory of the current availability of social services in neighborhoods;
3. A Survey of Existing Facilities: a review of the present condition of social service facilities in neighborhoods; and
4. Neighborhood Experience with H&CD Funds: an analysis of the neighborhoods' previous funding experience with Housing and Community Development programs.

Information developed through each of these elements of the study process were combined to produce our recommendations for priority neighborhoods. Further, recommendations were formulated with respect to the administrative structure through which the City can effectively operate the Neighborhood Centers Program. Suggestions regarding the process of developing centers were also offered.

Needs Assessment

The Needs Assessment analyzed neighborhoods according to thirteen basic indicators of social problems and possible needs for social services. The indicators were compiled from both census and other data which were available on a census tract basis. (Hence, it was necessary to define neighborhood boundaries to conform with census tracts.) Only data that were uniformly available for all neighborhoods and that were aggregated by census tract could be considered in the Needs Assessment. The thirteen Need Indicators were:

- Persons Below Poverty Level
- Families Receiving Supplemental Security Income
- Density: Persons Per Residential Acre
- Population Under 5 Years of Age
- Infant Death Rate
- Families Receiving AFDC
- Overcrowding: More Than One Person Per Room
- Minority Population
- Crime Rate: Major Offenses
- Unemployment Rate
- Recreational Space
- Dropout Rate
- Food Stamp Cases



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

<https://archive.org/details/inventoryofexist1975sanf>

The conclusions of the Needs Assessment were best interpreted in four general groupings of relative need: high, medium-high, medium, and low. Neighborhood ranking according to these designations were as follows:

High Need: Bayview-Hunters Point
 South of Market
 Mission
 Potrero Hill
 Western Addition

Medium-High
 Need: Bernal Heights
 North of Market
 Haight-Ashbury
 Ingleside

Medium
 Need: Visitacion Valley
 Chinatown
 North Beach
 Noe-Central

Low Need: Inner Richmond
 Outer Mission
 Inner Sunset

Neighborhoods whose average income is above that of the City (i.e., the remainder of San Francisco) were also analyzed according to the same Need Indicators. All such neighborhoods showed a low or medium-low need, confirming perceptions that income is the dominant factor related to neighborhood needs.

Social Services Inventory

Concurrent with the Needs Assessment, an inventory was compiled of social services available in each neighborhood. The inventory recorded the quantity of services available according to the numbers of clients served by neighborhood-oriented agencies, as well as the variety of services available. This survey was conducted through a telephone questionnaire, and information was collected from approximately 410 public and private agencies.

To facilitate comparisons of service availability among neighborhoods, the information reported by agencies was grouped in "service categories". These 21 categories were:

Adoption and Foster Homes	Food Services
Bilingual Programs	Health Services
Child Care	Handicapped Persons
Counseling	Information and Referral
Crime Prevention	Juvenile Delinquency Prevention
Cultural Activities	Legal Services
Drug and Alcohol Prevention	Mental Health Services
Educational Programs	Recreation
Emergency Relief	Senior Citizens
Employment Services	Youth Development
Family Planning	

Where agencies provided services which overlapped service categories, information was recorded in that category which represented their dominant service or emphasis. Subordinant services, however, were also noted.

Similarly with the Needs Assessment, the conclusions of the Social Services Inventory were best described in four general groupings of relative availability: very low, low, medium, and high. Neighborhood rankings according to these designations were as follows:

Very Low Availability:	Noe-Central Inner Richmond Outer Mission
Low Availability:	Visitacion Valley Inner Sunset Bernal Heights North Beach
Medium Availability:	Ingleside Haight-Ashbury North of Market
High Availability:	Potrero Hill Western Addition Mission Bayview-Hunters Point Chinatown South of Market

*

*

*

*

*

Both the Needs Assessment and the Social Services Inventory were designed to describe neighborhoods in need of social services.

These components of the analysis established a baseline for determining priority neighborhoods for location of neighborhood centers. The need for social services, however, had to be supplemented with a description of the condition of facilities presently operating in neighborhoods, as described below.

Survey of Existing Facilities

Site visits were made in each of the neighborhoods to develop an overview of needs for a neighborhood center based primarily on the current condition of existing social service facilities. Considerable information on the condition of facilities had already been collected through the Social Services Inventory described above. The purpose of the site review was to gain a first-rate view of facility conditions and to confirm the needs expressed in the Inventory.

Constraints of time and resources prevented a thorough, intricate assessment of all neighborhood facilities. Efforts were made, however, to visit a representative sample of existing facilities and to seek comments from key neighborhood representatives and/or service providers on the neighborhood's need and desire for a new center. Therefore, the results of the facilities survey are subjective impressions of need and reflect the relative conditions among neighborhoods. The primary results of this survey group neighborhoods in three general categories: good, fair, and poor. Neighborhood rankings according to these designations are as follows:

Good Condition:

Bayview-Hunters Point
Inner Sunset
Mission
North Beach
Western Addition

Fair Condition:

Haight-Ashbury
Inner Richmond
Noe-Central
Outer Mission
Potrero Hill
South of Market
Visitation Valley

Poor Condition:

Bernal Heights
Chinatown
Ingleside
North of Market

Neighborhood Experience With
Housing and Community Development Funds

It was suggested by both neighborhood representatives and City staff that consideration be given to previous experience with HUD-funded programs when determining priority neighborhoods for location of centers. These suggestions imply that neighborhoods which have not been significant beneficiaries of housing and community development funds in the past receive higher consideration than those which have. For purposes of considering this criterion, an inventory of previous HUD funding was compiled by neighborhood, as well as the more recent experience with the Housing and Community Development Program.

The inventory showed that most of the neighborhoods have benefited to some degree from the HUD programs which preceded the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. Only a few had participated in the major categorical programs, such as Redevelopment, Model Cities, and FACE; all but two, however, received some level of Federally-supported housing. Through the City's H&CD Program, new community development activities have benefitted all but three of the neighborhoods.

Information on neighborhood experience with HUD-funded programs, both prior to and since the enactment of the Housing and Community Development Program, was combined to show the relative extent to which neighborhoods have been beneficiaries of these funds. The results of this inventory grouped neighborhoods according to three general levels: high, medium, and low. Neighborhood rankings according to these designations are as follows:

High Level:

Bayview-Hunters Point
Mission
Western Addition

Medium Level:

Bernal Heights
Chinatown
Haight-Ashbury
North of Market
Visitacion Valley

Low Level:

Ingleside (OMI)
 Inner Richmond
 Inner Sunset
 Noe-Central
 North Beach
 Outer Mission
 South of Market*

*The Yerba Buena Center project was not counted as "benefitting" most neighborhood residents.

* * * * *

Recommendations for Priority Neighborhoods

Recommendations of priority neighborhoods for location of neighborhood centers were based on the analysis presented in the Needs Assessment, the Social Services Inventory, the Survey of Existing Facilities, and the Neighborhood Experience with Housing and Community Development Funds.

Priority categories were established according to certain concepts of a neighborhood center; namely; that new centers should be multi-purpose facilities, designed for flexible community use, and operated through community-based organizations. In addition, centers should be designed to house existing social service programs, and not developed on speculation that their existence will attract new services to the neighborhood.

Because the basis of analysis of each area of investigation ranged from statistical to factual to impressionistic, it was difficult to combine their results in a rigorous fashion and arrive at firm priority recommendations. Nevertheless, recommendations were derived by considering each of the results as they relate to one another, and grouping neighborhoods in three general categories of priority, as follows:

Priority "A": Neighborhoods to be considered immediately for location of a center, as determined generally by needs being higher than service availability, poor facilities, and/or a medium or low level of H&CD experience.

- Priority "B": Neighborhoods that show a need for a center and require further consideration, as determined generally by higher needs than service availability and/or fair conditions.
- Priority "C": Neighborhoods in which a new center might be useful, but for which some other type of City assistance may be more appropriate, as determined by low needs and service availability, good facilities, and/or a high level of H&CD experience.

Such intangibles as expressions of community interest and potential underestimation of needs in certain neighborhoods are also considered to produce the following recommendations:

- Priority "A": Bernal Heights
Chinatown
Ingleside
North of Market
South of Market
- Priority "B": Haight-Ashbury
Noe-Central
Potrero Hill
Western Addition (Hayes Valley)
- Priority "C": Bayview-Hunters Point
Inner Richmond
Inner Sunset
Mission
North Beach
Outer Mission
Western Addition (remainder)
Visitacion Valley

Administrative Structure

Review and analysis of the administrative structure through which the City can effectively implement and operate the Neighborhood Centers Program was based on discussions with key City officials, as well as directors of certain existing neighborhood centers. The results of these discussions directed that the administrative structure, or system, should be designed according to the general considerations of flexibility (e.g., to allow for variations within and between centers;) accountability (e.g., for expenditure of funds and center operations); and effectiveness (e.g., in planning and programming for center development).

In addition, certain policy assumptions guided the recommendations. These assumptions were as follows:

1. That the neighborhood centers should be designed to provide space for a variety of social service purposes, both publicly and privately-operated, i.e., multi-purpose centers,
2. That neighborhood centers should be designed as "community centers", and not simply as real estate facilities to house social service programs; and
3. That the planning and administration of neighborhood centers should involve to a maximum extent the participation of community residents and agencies.

Other factors recognized as important to designing the administrative system were (1) that program planning and administrative responsibility for the Neighborhood Centers Program should be separate, and (2) that the system should contain the capacity to contract for operation, as well as operate centers itself on a temporary basis. Recommendations for the most effective administrative structure vary also according to certain future policy decisions to be made by the City.

Under different circumstances, recommendations were as follows:

- A. If elements of the Model Cities Program continue to be funded past 1976 through the Model Cities Agency (whose geographic mandate is expanded), then *we recommend that the Model Cities Agency be designated as the administering agency.*
- B. If the Model Cities Agency is to be de-funded and dissolved by the end of 1976, and no successor agency is established, then *we recommend that an assistant in the Mayor's Office (probably full-time) be assigned the responsibility for administering the program.*
- C. If the City considers a reorganization strategy that will consolidate the administrative and contracting functions of several Federally-funded programs (i.e., the creation of a "Department of Community Services"), then *we recommend that an assistant in the Mayor's Office be assigned responsibility on a temporary basis until the strategy is implemented, and then, that the responsibility be transferred to this new department.*

Development Process

The process of moving from determination of priority neighborhoods to actual development of a new center requires specific consideration regarding facility location, as well as an implementation strategy. In general, it was recommended that the City consider certain locational criteria in the process of developing centers. Such specific steps, however, should await confirmation by the Board of Supervisors of priority neighborhoods and establishment of the appropriate administrative structure. Further, budget allocations should await selection of actual sites in those neighborhoods.

Two or three neighborhoods should be designated to permit flexibility and budgetary trade-offs regarding alternative treatment of sites. Following neighborhood designation, a more detailed needs and services analysis should be conducted in those neighborhoods with considerable participation from community representatives. An inventory of potential sites should be assembled and compared with specific community needs. Sites should be evaluated according to locational criteria, such as accessibility and acceptability to community residents, and designed for flexible use.

Once a specific site is agreed upon, it should be recommended for acquisition to the Board of Supervisors. The City should then acquire and develop the site, involving the Real Estate Department and the Bureaus of Engineering and Architecture. Other departments, such as the City Attorney's Office, will also be involved before the completed site can be contracted for operation to a representative community organization.

